

# LEX FEMINAE INDEX®

Brazil —2026 Edition

LEX FEMINAE  
INDEX

# LEX FEMINAE INDEX®

## Brazil —2026 Edition

Enforcement Assessment of Gender-Based Violence

Data Coverage: 2024

NATIONAL GRADE:

**D**

**Weak Enforcement**

Trend Indicator:

**Stagnant\***

The Lex Feminae Index evaluates whether legal systems deliver measurable protection against gender-based violence. The assessment is outcome-based. Legislative intent, policy declarations and strategic commitments are not considered. Only documented enforcement performance and publicly verifiable outcome data are examined.

This report presents the 2026 enforcement assessment of Brazil using the most recent consolidated national data available for the 2024 reporting cycle.

Brazil is a federal state. Criminal law is nationally defined, but prosecution and adjudication occur primarily at the state level. This assessment evaluates aggregated first-instance judicial performance across the national system.

The evaluation relies exclusively on official statistical publications, including:

- Anuário Brasileiro de Segurança Pública 2025 (police-recorded data, reference year 2024)
- Judicial case-flow data published by the Conselho Nacional de Justiça (cutoff 31 December 2024)
- CNJ Violência contra a Mulher thematic dashboard
- Official administrative reporting on protective measures under the Lei Maria da Penha

The assessment examines whether statutory recognition of femicide and domestic violence translates into operational enforcement in practice. It measures:

- Police-recorded lethal and non-lethal violence
- Judicial intake and annual case resolution
- Protective measure utilization and breach rates
- Backlog and congestion indicators
- Public accessibility and offence-specific disaggregation of enforcement outcomes

Prevalence surveys are referenced for contextual background but are not used as grading inputs.

Brazil's legal framework includes specific recognition of femicide and a comprehensive domestic violence statute under the Lei Maria da Penha. The present assessment therefore focuses on enforcement conversion, judicial throughput, protective compliance and conviction traceability rather than codification.

The central question is structural:

**Does enforcement practice produce measurable protection for women after violence occurs?**

The findings below assess Brazil under the Lex Feminae Index grading framework.

# METHODOLOGICAL FRAMEWORK

## **A. Data Scope**

This assessment relies exclusively on official statistical publications issued by the Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública and the Conselho Nacional de Justiça.

No NGO datasets, advocacy estimates, media compilations or external projections are used.

## **B. Administrative Counting Limits**

Victim figures reflect administrative counting by infraction and may include multiple entries per individual within a given procedure.

## **C. Police–Justice Interoperability Limits**

Where police and judicial datasets are not fully interoperable, structural constraints limit direct case-level matching between recorded offences and judicial proceedings within the national reporting architecture.

## **D. Conviction Timing Clarification**

Conviction figures reflect cases reaching judicial resolution within the reporting year and do not represent direct cohort conversion between complaints registered and convictions issued in the same year.

## **E. Federal Structure Clarification**

Brazil operates a federalized justice system in which criminal prosecution, judicial administration, and protection enforcement are conducted at state level under national constitutional and penal frameworks.

Police intake is recorded at state level and consolidated nationally.

Judicial case-flow is reported through the National Council of Justice (CNJ) dashboard.

However, conviction disaggregation and sanction composition are not nationally consolidated by gender-based violence category.

This edition includes state-level grading to assess enforcement variation within the federal structure.

The national grade reflects the dominant structural pattern observed across state systems.

# LEGAL FRAMEWORK

## I. Legal Recognition & Statutory Framework

Brazil criminalizes femicide as a qualified form of homicide under the Penal Code.

Domestic violence is governed by the Lei Maria da Penha, which establishes protective measures, procedural safeguards and specialized judicial mechanisms.

Sexual violence, including rape and rape of a vulnerable person is criminalized under the Penal Code.

Sexual harassment and stalking are also criminal offenses under national legislation.

Legal recognition of gender-based violence offences is explicit and operational.

**ASSESSMENT:** Legal framework comprehensive and explicitly recognizes femicide.

# REPORTING

## II. Reporting Accessibility & Victim Registration

### **2024 police-recorded data indicate:**

- Femicides: 1,492
- Female intentional lethal violence (broader homicide category): 2,485
- Approximately 60% of lethal violence against women classified as femicide

Police data is consolidated nationally through state public security secretariats and the Fórum Brasileiro de Segurança Pública (FBSP).

Operational classification of femicide is measurable within homicide reporting.

### **Judicial case-flow data published by the National Council of Justice (CNJ) indicate:**

- New domestic violence cases: 907,932
- Cases judged: 525,384
- Cases closed (baixados): 893,477
- Pending stock at year-end: 1,217,646

These figures reflect national aggregation of state tribunal reporting.

### **Protective measures in 2024:**

- Protective measures granted: 555,001
- Breaches recorded: 101,656
- Breach rate: approximately 18%
- Femicides under active protective order: 52

Protection mechanisms are deployed at significant scale across jurisdictions.

### **ASSESSMENT**

Police-recorded violence is nationally consolidated and publicly accessible.

Judicial case-flow metrics are centrally reported through CNJ dashboards.

Femicide classification is operational within homicide statistics.

However, while intake and procedural movement are measurable, outcome-layer transparency remains incomplete.

Conviction composition, sanction type, and breach-to-custody escalation are not nationally disaggregated within publicly accessible datasets.

Protective measures are widely issued, but breach incidence and lethal cases under active protection indicate fragility in enforcement continuity.

# PROSECUTION

## III. Prosecution Filtering

Prosecutorial advancement is assessed through first-instance criminal proceedings (1<sup>o</sup> grau, originário, conhecimento criminal), reflecting cases formally admitted into adjudication before state tribunals.

### **Femicide**

- New cases: 3,516
- Cases judged: 5,993
- Cases closed: 3,341
- Pending at year-end: 9,609

Annual judgment volume exceeded annual intake, indicating active adjudication and partial backlog reduction in lethal violence cases.

- Average time to first judgment: approximately 593 days.

However, publicly accessible national dashboards do not disaggregate judgment outcomes by offence category. It is not possible to determine how many judged cases resulted in:

- Conviction
- Acquittal
- Dismissal
- Procedural extinction
- Alternative measures

Conviction conversion rates for femicide cannot be externally verified through consolidated national reporting instruments.

## **Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)**

- New cases: 907,932
- Cases judged: 525,384
- Cases closed (baixados): 893,477
- Pending at year-end: 1,217,646

Annual adjudication volume remains below annual intake, and pending stock exceeds one million cases. Domestic violence case-flow reflects structural congestion under sustained intake pressure.

- Average time to first judgment: approximately 522 days.

Judicial throughput is substantial in absolute terms. However, as with lethal violence cases, Brazil does not publish nationally consolidated data disaggregating adjudicated outcomes by sanction type or disposition category.

It is not possible to determine how many judged IPV cases resulted in conviction, acquittal, dismissal, or diversion.

Full intake-to-conviction conversion cannot be calculated.

## **ASSESSMENT**

Brazil demonstrates measurable judicial movement in both lethal and non-lethal gender-based violence categories. Throughput is operational and nationally reported through CNJ case-flow metrics.

However, conviction composition and sanction outcomes are not disaggregated within publicly accessible national datasets.

Judicial activity is demonstrable.

Judicial outcome composition is not fully transparent due to the absence of publicly disaggregated conviction and acquittal data.

## IV. Conviction Ratios

Conviction ratios are not publicly disaggregated by offence category within official national reporting instruments.

Outcome-specific sentencing data (conviction, acquittal, dismissal) is not publicly accessible in a consolidated, offence-specific format.

### **ASSESSMENT:**

Conviction conversion is not publicly verifiable due to the absence of offence-specific sentencing disaggregation in official national reporting instruments.

Judicial activity is observable. Outcome transparency remains limited.

# PROTECTION

## V. Protective Measures – Structural Function

Brazil maintains an expansive protective order regime under Lei Maria da Penha.

2024 data indicate:

- Protective measures granted: 555,001
- Breaches recorded: 101,656
- Breach rate: approximately 18%
- Femicides under active protective order: 52

Protection access is operational and high-volume across jurisdictions.

An 18% breach rate reflects measurable non-compliance within the protective regime. The occurrence of femicides under active protection indicates failure in certain escalation scenarios.

However, publicly available national datasets do not consolidate the enforcement chain following breach. No nationally aggregated reporting discloses:

- Arrest following breach
- Prosecution for breach
- Conviction for breach
- Custodial sanction following breach

Breach-to-custody escalation cannot be externally traced through consolidated national instruments.

### **ASSESSMENT**

Protective mechanisms are accessible and deployed at scale.

Breach incidence demonstrates structural fragility in compliance.

However, enforcement consequences following breach are not nationally disaggregated.

Protection enforcement escalation is not fully auditable.

Protection reliability cannot be comprehensively verified across the sanction chain.

# SENTENCING

No nationally consolidated dataset distinguishes:

- Immediate custodial imprisonment
- Suspended sentencing
- Alternative measures
- Fine-only sanctions

Sanction depth relative to intake cannot be externally quantified.

Enforcement, defined as adjudication followed by sentencing, is partially measurable but not disaggregated.

# DATA INTEGRITY & TRANSPARENCY

## VI. Integrity & Transparency

Brazil publishes:

- National police-recorded crime data.
- National judicial case-flow data through the National Council of Justice dashboard.
- Protective measure statistics.
- Judicial intake, resolution volume and backlog indicators are publicly accessible.

However:

Offence-specific conviction and acquittal disaggregation are not directly available within the thematic violence dashboard interface.

Precise conviction-rate calculation requires extraction from broader criminal statistical datasets not readily presented by offence category in the same reporting environment.

Observatory-style institutional publications emphasize structural initiatives but do not provide conviction-level enforcement metrics.

As a result, judicial engagement is publicly observable, but conviction conversion and sentencing severity are not fully externally auditable within thematic reporting tools.

This limits enforcement traceability.

### **ASSESSMENT:**

- High national data consolidation.
- Transparency is strong at case-flow level.
- Offence-level judicial disaggregation incomplete.
- Conviction and sentencing outcomes are not publicly disaggregated by offence category.

## CLIMATE RISK MODIFIER

### VII. Climate Risk Context

Brazil experiences periodic natural disasters including flooding, typhoons, wildfires and extreme heat events that result in temporary displacement.

Official enforcement datasets do not integrate disaster-status linked to displacement coding within gender-based violence offence reporting. Climate-displacement-specific enforcement tracking is not consolidated within national judicial statistics.

Brazil is not classified within the Index framework as a high structural climate-displacement vulnerability jurisdiction.

The Climate Risk Modifier does not alter grade determination for the 2024 reporting cycle.

The question becomes:

**Does the justice system treat women in a flood shelter with the same enforcement seriousness as women in stable housing?**

# STRUCTURAL ASSESSMENT

## **DOES THE LAW PROTECT WOMEN IN PRACTICE?**

Brazil demonstrates:

- Extremely high intake volume
- Substantial judicial throughput
- Massive case congestion stock
- Broad access to protective measures
- Measurable breach incidence

However:

- Over 1.2 million cases remain pending
- Conviction composition cannot be quantified
- Custodial exposure cannot be calculated
- Sanction severity cannot be externally verified
- Breach-to-sanction escalation is not nationally consolidated

The system functions procedurally.

It processes cases at scale.

It grants protection at scale.

However, enforcement depth cannot be fully audited due to sanction opacity and backlog magnitude.

Brazil reflects a system under structural strain rather than systemic collapse.

# AUDIT GRADE ASSESSMENT

Under Lex Feminae Index criteria:

**Brazil does not meet C — Partial Accountability — because:**

- Sanction composition is not disaggregated
- Custodial exposure cannot be externally quantified
- Case congestion remains structurally high
- Enforcement-chain traceability is incomplete

**Brazil does not meet E — Severe Enforcement Deficiency — because:**

- Judicial throughput is substantial
- Protection measures are accessible at scale
- National judicial reporting exists
- Enforcement institutions are operational

The dominant structural pattern is:

Operational enforcement under congestion with incomplete sanction transparency.

Brazil's 2024 enforcement profile aligns with:

Grade D — Weak Enforcement

Trend Indicator: → Structurally Strained

# FINAL GRADE

**D —**

**Weak Enforcement**

**Trend Indicator:**

**→ Stagnant\***

\* Stagnation reflects structural persistence of enforcement patterns across recent reporting cycles as documented in official statistical continuity. As this constitutes the initial Lex Feminae Index baseline for Brazil, directional movement will be assessed in subsequent editions using standardized longitudinal indicators.

# STATE-LEVEL JUDICIAL ENFORCEMENT ASSESSMENT

## Scope and Comparative Framework

This section evaluates the performance of all Brazilian State Courts (Tribunais de Justiça) in handling violence against women cases in 2024.

Each state is assessed individually using standardized procedural indicators extracted from the CNJ DataJud panel. The objective is to measure judicial enforcement capacity, demand absorption, congestion levels, and resolution speed within each jurisdiction.

The analysis enables direct state-to-state comparison under the same federal criminal framework and procedural rules. All courts operate under identical legal standards. Performance differences therefore reflect structural, managerial, or resource variations rather than legislative disparity.

# METHODOLOGY

## **1. Data Scope**

- Jurisdiction: 27 State Courts (TJ)
- Case Type: Violence against women, including domestic violence and femicide
- Instance: First instance, criminal jurisdiction
- Year of reference: 2024

Source: CNJ DataJud (processos – casos novos)

## **2. Core Indicators Used**

Each state is assessed using the following metrics:

- New cases (Entradas)
- Cases judged (Julgados)
- Cases closed (Baixados)
- Pending cases (Pendientes – total and net)
- Demand Absorption Index (Índice de Atendimento à Demanda)
- Congestion Rate (Bruta and Líquida)
- Average time to first judgment
- Average time to case closure

Where available, femicide data is examined alongside domestic violence intake to contextualize lethality within overall caseload volume.

## **3. Analytical Logic**

Performance is evaluated across three dimensions:

- Demand Absorption
- Structural Congestion High congestion reflects systemic case accumulation and limited throughput.
- Timeliness Extended resolution times signal operational delay, even where volume appears controlled.
- Composite Grading

Each state receives a single composite grade reflecting overall enforcement performance across:

Grades do not measure prevalence of violence.

They measure judicial response capacity.

#### **4. Comparative Interpretation**

- Cross-state comparison is conducted using identical metrics and thresholds.
- Differences in grade reflect performance variation, not demographic scale alone.
- High-volume states are not penalized for size.
- Low-volume states are not rewarded for small intake if structural congestion remains high.

The assessment evaluates enforcement efficiency, not crime incidence.

# SUBNATIONAL ENFORCEMENT VARIATION

1. Acre (TIAC) **Grade: C**
2. Alagoas (TJAL) **Grade: C**
3. Amazonas (TJAM) **Grade: C**
4. Amapá (TJAP) **Grade: C**
5. Bahia (TJBA) **Grade: D**
6. Ceará (TJCE) **Grade: C**
7. Espírito Santo (TJES) **Grade: C**
8. Goiás (TJGO) **Grade: C**
9. Maranhão (TJMA) **Grade: D**
10. Minas Gerais (TJMG) **Grade: D**
11. Mato Grosso do Sul (TJMS) **Grade: D**
12. Mato Grosso (TJMT) **Grade: D**
13. Pará (TJPA) **Grade: D**
14. Paraíba (TJPB) **Grade: C**
15. Pernambuco (TJPE) **Grade: C**
16. Piauí (TJPI) **Grade: D**
17. Paraná (TJPR) **Grade: C**
18. Rio De Janeiro (TJRJ) **Grade: D**
19. Rio Grande Do Norte (TJRN) **Grade: C**
20. Rondônia (TJRO) **Grade: C**
21. Roraima (TJRR) **Grade: C**
22. Rio Grande Do Sul (TJRS) **Grade: D**
23. Santa Catarina (TJSC) **Grade: C**
24. Sergipe (TJSE) **Grade: D**
25. São Paulo (TJSP) **Grade: D**
26. Tocantins (TJTO) **Grade: C**